



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/981,906	10/19/2001	Marc LeFevre	10013125-1	7302

7590

07/08/2005

HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
Intellectual Property Administration
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER

SHAH, NILESH R

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2195	

DATE MAILED: 07/08/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/981,906

Applicant(s)

LEFEVRE ET AL.

Examiner

Nilesh Shah

Art Unit

2195

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 4/19/05.
- 2a) ☒ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-19 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-19 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-19 are presented for examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

2. Claims 1-7, 15-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter
3. Claims 1-7, 15-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. A method is not tangibly embodied in a manner so as to be executable. Specifically, as claimed, it is uncertain what performs each of the claimed method steps. Moreover, each of the claimed steps, inter alia, (receiving, accessing, determining, selecting) can be practiced mentally in conjunction with a pen and paper.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.
5. Claims 1-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ratnaraj et al (6,185,567) (hereinafter Ratnaraj) in view of Fink (6,289,463).
6. As per claim 1, Ratnaraj teaches the invention substantially as claimed including a method for configuring a target device to operate as peripheral hardware for a host device, comprising the steps of:

determining if there is a match of the log-in request host designator to a host designator (col. 3 lines 46-50; col. 5 lines 5-8; col. 9 lines 25-34; col. 3 lines 7 lines 16).
7. Ratnaraj does not specifically teach the use of an selecting an operating system.

Fink teaches accessing a table of host designators and associated O/S protocol types (fig. 3 element 302,310,305; col. 7 lines 25-50);

receiving a log-in request to connect the target device to the host device, wherein the log-in request includes a host designator identifying a type of host device(col. 2 lines 25-40; col. 4 lines 40-66) and;

selecting an O/S type protocol associated with the match to the host designator such that the O/S protocol selected is used by the target device to interpret commands received from the host device (col. 2 lines 25-40; col. 4 lines 40-66; col.3 lines 1-17).

8. It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Fink and Ratnaraj because Fink's use of being able to select an operating system would improve Ratnaraj's system by allowing for each user to be able to change from different operating system.
9. As per claim 2, Ratnaraj teaches a method wherein the host designator is a worldwide name (col. 1 lines 10-13).
10. As per claim 3, Fink teaches a method further comprising the step of determining if a mode parameter is set for a default O/S protocol; and selecting that default O/S protocol unless there is a match of the log- in request host designator in the table (fig. 3 element 302,310,305; col. 7 lines 25-50; col.3 lines 1-17).
11. As per claim 4, Fink teaches a method, further comprising the step of receiving a command from the host; and determining if the command is an O/S dependent command; and wherein the step of accessing the table is only performed if the received command is an O/S dependent command (fig. 3 element 302,310,305; col. 7 lines 25-50; col.3 lines 1-17).

12. As per claim 5, Fink teaches a method further comprising the step of storing the table in non-volatile memory in the target device (col. 4 lines 50-60).
13. As per claim 6, Fink teaches a method wherein the target device is a memory array (col. 4 lines 50-60).
14. Claim 7 is rejected based on claim 1 above.
15. Claim 8 is rejected based on claim 2 above.
16. Claim 9 is rejected based on claim 5 above.
17. Claim 10 is rejected based on claim 4 above.
18. Claim 11 is rejected based on claim 1 above.
19. Claim 12 is rejected based on claim 4 above.
20. Claim 13 is rejected based on claim 3 above.
21. As per claim 14, Ratnaraj a method further comprising the steps of:

receiving a command from the host device and determining if the command is an O/S dependent command (col. 3 lines 46-50; col. 5 lines 5-8; col. 9 lines 25-34; col. 3 lines 7 lines 16).

Fink teaches wherein the steps of accessing the table, determining if there is a match, and selecting an O/S protocol are only performed if the command received is an O/S dependent command (fig. 3 element 302,310,305; col. 7 lines 25-50).

22. As per claim 15, Fink a method wherein the target device communicates with the host device via a SCSI interface (col. 4 lines 10-25; col. 5 lines 22-37; col. 2 lines 33-39).

23. As per claim 16, Fink a method, wherein the target device is directly connected to the host device via the SCSI interface (col. 4 lines 10-25; col. 5 lines 22-37; col. 2 lines 33-39).

24. As per claim 17, Fink a method wherein the target device is a peripheral device of the host (col. 4 lines 10-25; col. 5 lines 22-37; col. 2 lines 33-39).

25. As per claim 18, Fink a method wherein the target device communicates with the host device via a SCSI interface (col. 4 lines 10-25; col. 5 lines 22-37; col. 2 lines 33-39).

26. As per claim 19, Fink a method wherein the target device is directly connected to the host device via the SCSI interface (col. 4 lines 10-25; col. 5 lines 22-37; col. 2 lines 33-39).

Response to Arguments

27. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-19 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

28. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).
29. A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.
30. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nilesh Shah whose telephone number is (571)272-3771. The examiner can normally be reached on 9-5.

Art Unit: 2195

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Meng An can be reached on (571)272-3756. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Nilesh Shah
Examiner
Art Unit 2127

NS
June 23, 2005


MENG-AN T. AN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2101